

REMARKS

Claims 21 - 30 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 – 20 have been cancelled. Claims 21 – 30 have been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Zumeris (U.S. Pat. No. 5,696,421). This rejection is rendered moot by the amendment.

Claims 1 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Magnussen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,870,304). This rejection is rendered moot by the amendment.

Claims 15, 16, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Diefenbach (U.S. Pat. No. 6,121,717). This rejection is rendered moot by the amendment.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Zumeris (U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,140). This rejection is rendered moot by the amendment.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zumeris (U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,140) in view of Miyazawa (U.S. Pat. No. 6,885,615). This rejection is rendered moot by the amendment.

Claims 8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zumeris (U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,140). This rejection is rendered moot by the amendment.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zumeris (U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,140). This rejection is rendered moot by the amendment.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diefenbach (U.S. Pat. No. 6,121,717). This rejection is rendered moot by the amendment.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 21-30 have been added and recite allowable subject matter. Claim 21 recites a drive unit comprising a main driven element, two sub driven elements, a pair of actuator units and control means. The control means controls the pair of actuator units so that the main driven element is driven in one of a plurality of drive modes. The plurality of drive modes includes a differential mode in which the pair of actuator units carry out a differential motion with each other to drive the main driven element via the two sub driven elements.

As supported by the Specification, since the pair of actuator units carry out a differential motion with each other to drive the main driven element, countervailing power is generated between the pair of actuator units. Specification, Paragraph 129. Therefore, it is possible to prevent shakiness due to backlash or the like (for example, shakiness during a normal drive or shakiness at normal-reverse converting time).

Specification, Paragraph 129. Further, it is also possible to move the main driven element toward a target position accurately. Specification, Paragraph 129.

The cited prior art fails to teach, suggest, or disclose the drive unit recited by claim 21. Although the cited prior art discloses that a plurality of actuators are used to heighten drive power for a driven element or to change the displacing direction of the driven element, it does not disclose the limitations recited by claim 21. Namely, the prior art does not disclose the configuration in which drive power for the driven element (that is, the main driven element) is to be lowered in order to prevent shakiness due to backlash or the like. More specifically, the cited prior art fails to teach, suggest, or disclose a differential mode in which the pair of actuator units carry out a differential motion with each other to drive the main driven element, as recited by claim 21. Therefore, the prior art fails to teach each and every limitation of claim 21, which defines over the prior art.

With regard to claims 22-30, each depend from claim 21, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, claims 22-30 each define over the prior art.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Jan. 6, 2006

By: 
G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/MPD